

SwarUpa-negation of illusory silver

An important issue arises regarding negation of illusory silver in all three periods of time after the knowledge of shell. VedAnta ParibhAshA deals with it as under: -

ननु शुक्तौ रजतस्य प्रतिभाससमये सत्ताभ्युपगमे "नेदं रजतम्" इति त्रैकालिकनिषेधज्ञानं न स्यात् । किन्तु "इदानीमिदं न रजतम्" इति स्यात् , "इदानीं घटः श्यामो न" इतिवत् इति चेत् न । नहि तत्र रजतत्वावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकाभावो निषेधधीविषयः । किन्तु लौकिकपारमार्थिकत्वावच्छिन्नप्रातिभासिकरजतप्रतियोगिताकः व्यधिकरणधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकाभावाभ्युपगमात् ।

ननु प्रातिभासिके रजते पारमार्थिकत्वमवगतं न वा । अनवगमे प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकावच्छिन्नरजतसत्त्वज्ञानाभावादभावप्रत्यक्षानुपपत्तिः । अवगमेऽपरोक्षावभासस्य तत्कालीनविषयसत्तानियतत्वाद् रजते पारमार्थिकत्वमप्यनिर्वचनीयं रजतवदेवोत्पन्नमिति तदवच्छिन्नरजतसत्त्वे तदवच्छिन्नाभावस्तत्र कथं वर्तत इति चेत् न । पारमार्थिकत्वस्याधिष्ठाननिष्ठस्य रजते प्रतिभाससम्भवेन रजतनिष्ठपारमार्थिकत्वोत्पत्त्यनभ्युपगमात् । यत्रारोप्यमसन्निकृष्टं तत्रैव प्रातिभासिकवस्तुत्पत्तेरङ्गीकारात् । अत एव इन्द्रियसन्निकृष्टतया जपाकुसुमगतलौहित्यस्य स्फटिके भानसम्भवात् न स्फटिकेऽनिर्वचनीयलौहित्योत्पत्तिः । नन्वेवं यत्र जपाकुसुमं द्रव्यान्तरव्यवधानादसन्निकृष्टं तत्र लौहित्यप्रतीत्या प्रातिभासिकं लौहित्यं स्वीक्रियतामिति चेत् न, इष्टत्वात् ।

Objection 1: If one accepts the existence of (prAtibhAsika) silver in the shell at the time of appearance, then will it not lead to the impossibility of the knowledge "it is not silver" in the form of negation of silver in all three periods of time? The knowledge of negation should instead be like "Now there is no silver".

Answer: No. The object of the knowledge of negation is not abhAva-of silver-which-has-pratidyogitA-delimited-by-rajata-tva (rajata-tva-avachchhinna-pratidyogitA-nirUpita-abhAva). The object of the knowledge of negation, on the other hand, is abhAva-of-prAtibhAsika-silver-having-pratidyogitA-delimited-by-laukika-pAramArthikatva (laukika-pArAmArthikatva-avachchhinna-prAtibhAsika-rajat-pratidyogitAka-abhAva). Thus, since there is acceptance of vyAdhikaraNa-dharma-avachchhinna-pratidyogitAka-abhAva, there will be no contradiction.

Objection 2: But there was perception of laukika-pAramArthikatva in prAtibhAsika-silver. And as per your rule, there must be the existence of object during perception. Therefore, just as you accept creation of anirvachanIya-silver, similarly you should accept creation of anirvachanIya-laukika-pAramArthikatva in prAtibhAsika-silver. And once you accept that, it is clear that prAtibhAsika-rajata is

delimited by *laukika-pAramArthikatva* as this feature will inhere in it. Then it will no longer remain a *vyAdhikaraNa-dharma*. Thus, once existence of *laukika-pAramArthikatva-avachchhinna-prAtibhAsika-rajata* is accepted, you cannot posit *abhAva-of-prAtibhAsika-silver-having-pratiyogitA-delimited-by-laukika-pAramArthikatva*.

Answer: No. *Laukika-pAramArthikatva-of-substratum* can appear in the *prAtibhAsika-silver*. Therefore, we do not accept creation of *anirvachanIya-laukika-pAramArthikatva-in-silver*. The *prAtibhAsika* entity is created only if the superimposed entity is not in contact with senses. This is why, if both red-flower and transparent-crystal are in contact with eyes, then the redness-of-crystal is not accepted to be created and it is not held to be *anirvachanIya*. Rather, it is the redness-of-flower that appears as redness-of-crystal. (<https://youtu.be/SXMg5vSkK-4>)

Objection 3: What if the red-flower is not in contact with eyes due to the obstruction of some other entity and yet redness-of-crystal is seen? Do you accept creation of *anirvachanIya* redness-of-crystal in that situation?

Answer: Yes. In that situation, we do accept creation of *anirvachanIya* redness-of-crystal.

Couple of issues emanate here for discussion.

With respect to Objection 1:

First and foremost, when we say “this is not silver”, we do negate silver in all three periods of time. We not only say that there is no silver now, but also say that there was no silver ever. And while saying so, the *pratiyogI-silver* has *pratiyogitA* which is delimited **not** by *laukika-pAramArthikatva* but by *rajata-tva* itself, that is, by its very *swarUpa* as *prAtibhAsika-rajata*. Thus, it is not an example of *vyAdhikaraNa-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitA-nirUpita-abhAva* rather it is *samAna-adhikaraNa-avachchhinna-pratiyogitA-nirUpita-abhAva*. MadhusUdan SaraswatI clarifies this in second-mithyAtva-vichAra in *advaita-siddhi*. The relevant portions are discussed as under: -

स्वरूपेणैव त्रैकालिकनिषेधप्रतियोगित्वस्य प्रपञ्चे शुक्तिरूप्ये चाङ्गीकारात् ।

In both world and silver-in-shell, the *pratiyogitA* of *traikAlika-nishedha* is by *swarUpa* only.

तथा हि – शुक्तौ रजतभ्रमानन्तरम् अधिष्ठानतत्त्वसाक्षात्कारे रूप्यं नास्ति नासीन्नभविष्यतीति स्वरूपेणैव, 'नेह नाने'ति श्रुत्या च प्रपञ्चस्य स्वरूपेणैव निषेधप्रतीतिः ।

After the illusion of silver in shell is over on account of perception of substratum, the cognition of negation is by swarUpa as 'silver was not there, it is not there and it will not be there'. Similarly, in the Shruti 'na iha nAnA asti kinchan', the cognition of negation of world is by swarUpa.

न च – तत्र लौकिकपरमार्थरजतमेव स्वरूपेण निषेधप्रतियोगीति – वाच्यम् ; भ्रमबाधयोर्वैयधिकरणापत्तेः; अप्रसक्तप्रतिषेधापत्तेश्च ।

Further, it should not be said that the pratiyogI of nishedha is vyAvahArika-silver by swarUpa. This is so because there will be mismatch between the object of illusion and bAdha (the object of illusion is prAtibhAsika-rajata whereas the bAdha is of vyAvahArika-rajata). Further, there will be occasion of negation of something which was not present (vyAvahArika-rajata was not present).

न च – 'त्रैकालिकनिषेधं प्रति स्वरूपेणापणस्थं रूप्यं पारमार्थिकत्वाकारेण प्रातिभासिकं वा प्रतियोगी'ति मतहानिः स्यादिति – वाच्यम् ; अस्याचार्यवचसः पारमार्थिकलौकिकरजततादात्म्येन प्रतीतं प्रातिभासिकमेव रजतं प्रतियोगीत्यर्थः ।

And one should not quote the mentioned statement of VivaraNa to show fallacy in our view (that it is the prAtibhAsika-rajata which is the pratiyogI by swarUpa of traikAlika-nishedha). This is so because the meaning of AchArya's words are as follows: The pratiyogI of traikAlika-nishedha is prAtibhAsika-rajata alone which appears in tAdAtmya with vyAvahArika-rajata.

तच्च स्वरूपेण पारमार्थिकत्वेन वेत्यनास्थायां वा शब्दः ।

The word "or" employed in VivaraNa is to indicate concession and not alternative. This is indicated on account of tushyatu-durjana-nyAya. Thus, VivaraNa means only this – the pratiyogI of negation is prAtibhAsika-rajata which appears in tAdAtmya with vyAvahArika-rajata (which is kept in a shop). As tushyatu-durjana-nyAya, AchArya states that negation is vyAvahArikatvena (the view of VedAnta-ParibhAshA).

एतावदुक्तिश्च पुरोवर्तितादात्म्येनैव रजतं प्रतीयत इति मतनिरासार्थं लौकिकपरमार्थरजततादात्म्येनापि प्रतीयत इति प्रतिपादयितुं च ।

This statement is made with an intention to negate the view that prAtibhAsika-rajata appears in tAdAtmya with 'only' the object in front of us i.e. shell. The statement is made to propound that prAtibhAsika-rajata appears in tAdAtmya with vyAvahArika-rajata also.

तदुक्तं तत्त्वप्रदीपिकायां – ‘तस्माल्लौकिकपरमार्थरजतमेव नेदं रजतमिति निषेधप्रतियोगीति पूर्वाचार्याणां वाचोयुक्तिरपि पुरोवर्तिनि रजतार्थिनः प्रवृत्तिदर्शनात् लौकिकपरमार्थरजतत्वेनापरोक्षतया प्रतीतस्य कालत्रयेऽपि लौकिकपरमार्थरजतमिदं न भवतीति निषेधप्रतियोगितामङ्गीकृत्य नेतव्ये’ति ।

It is said in ChitsukhI also – therefore, even though the statement in VivaraNa seems to indicate that vyAvahArika-rajata is the pratiyogI of nishedha, it is actually said keeping in mind the action of the one who wants silver. Such a person sees the prAtibhAsika-rajata which is perceived in tAdAtmya with vyAvahArika-rajata. However, “this” (prAtibhAsika-rajata appearing in tAdAtmya with vyAvahArika-rajata) is not vyAvahArika-rajata in three periods of time. This is how the pratiyogitA of nishedha is to be accepted.

अयमाशयः – एकविभक्त्यन्तपदोपस्थापिते धर्मिणि प्रतियोगिनि च नञोऽन्योन्याभावबोधकत्वनियमस्य व्युत्पत्तिबलसिद्धत्वात् “घटः पटो न भवती”ति वाक्यव“दिदं रजतं न भवती”ति वाक्यस्य अन्योन्याभावबोधकत्वे स्थिते अभिलाषजन्यप्रतीतितुल्यत्वादभिलष्यमानप्रतीतेः नेदं रजतमिति वाक्याभिलष्यप्रतीतेरन्योन्याभावविषयत्वमेव । तथा चेदंशब्दनिर्दिष्टे पुरोवर्तिप्रतीतिकरजते रजतशब्दनिर्दिष्टव्यावहारिकरजतान्योन्याभावप्रतीतेरार्थिकं मिथ्यात्वम्

The intended meaning is this – if the dharmI and pratiyogI have same case-endings, then negation indicates anyonya-abhAva such as “pot is not cloth”. Likewise, “idam rajatam na bhavati” indicates anyonya-abhAva. Here, idam refers to prAtibhAsika-rajata which has anyonya-abhAva with vyAvahArika-silver. Thus, there is mithyAtvam of prAtibhAsika-rajata by arthApatti.

‘नात्र रजतमिति वाक्याभिलष्या तु प्रतीतिरत्यन्ताभावविषया ; भिन्नविभक्त्यन्तपदोपस्थापितयोरेव धर्मिप्रतियोगिनोर्नञः संसर्गाभावबोधकत्वनियमात् । सा च पुरोवर्तिप्रतीतरजतस्यैव व्यावहारिकमत्यन्ताभावं विषयीकरोतीति कण्ठोक्तमेव मिथ्यात्वम् ।

However, when the usage is “there is no silver here”, it is an example of atyanta-abhAva as dharmI and pratiyogI have different case-endings. Thus, this statement conveys the mithyAtvam of prAtibhAsika-rajata directly as opposed to by arthApatti as it has the object as vyAvahArika-atyanta-abhAva of prAtibhAsika-silver.

We see that once the illusion of silver in shell is over after cognition of substratum, there is an understanding - there was no silver, there is no silver and there will be no silver. This understanding is negation of silver by swarUpa. It should not be argued that only laukika-paramArtha-rajata is the pratiyogI of negation by swarUpa. Because that will lead to mismatch in the object of bhrama ‘this is

silver’ and object of bAdha ‘this is not silver’. It is a general rule that prApti and nishedha have same object whereas in this case, the object of prApti is prAtibhAsika-rajata whereas object of bAdha is vyAvahArika-rajata. Further, during bhrama, it is prAtibhAsika-rajata which is perceived and not vyAvahArika-rajata. Therefore, if one says that vyAvahArika-rajata is being negated, it will amount to negating that which was never perceived.

The statement in VivaraNa – त्रैकालिकनिषेधं प्रति स्वरूपेणापणस्थं रूप्यं पारमार्थिकत्वाकारेण प्रातिभासिकं वा प्रतियोगी’ – merely means that the pratiyogI of negation is prAtibhAsika-silver which appeared in tAdAtmya with vyAvahArika-silver. The favoured view of VivaraNa is holding prAtibhAsika-silver as the pratiyogI and it is only by tushyatu-durjana-nyAya that prAtibhAsika-rajata is vyAvahArikatvena conceded to be the pratiyogI as held in VedAnta-ParibhAshA.

Further, ‘this is not silver’ indicates anyonya-abhAva of prAtibhAsika-rajata vis-à-vis vyAvahArika-rajata and conveys mithyAtva of prAtibhAsika-rajata by arthApatti. ‘There is no silver here’ conveys mithyAtva of prAtibhAsika-rajata directly by definition as it objectifies the atyanta-abhAva of prAtibhAsika-rajata in shell.

BhAshya-vArtika also says - तच्च व्यधिकरणधर्मावच्छिन्नविशेष्यकज्ञानमित्यपास्तं, नेदं रजतमिति स्वरूपबाधानुपपत्तेः।

With respect to Objection 2 and 3:

Once it is clear that it is not vyAdhikaraNa-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-abhAva as explained in VedAnta ParibhAshA, the objections 2 and 3 of VedAnta-ParibhAshA are non-starters. The objections tried to argue that anirvachanIya-laukika-pAramArthikatva was created in silver as there was perception of prAtibhAsika-rajata as vyAvahArika-rajata. This was refuted by stating that the perceived laukika-pAramArthikatva was not created but it was of shell. And thus, it remained a vyAdhikaraNa-dharma. But as we saw from advaita-siddhi, it is not a case of vyAdhikaraNa-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitA-nirUpita-abhAva at all.

However, it still is important to understand the mechanism of creation of redness-of-crystal. PanchapAdikA states the redness-of-crystal to be mithyA i.e. prAtibhAsika i.e. anirvachanIya. In Advaita-siddhi, MadhusUdan SaraswatI states that redness-of-crystal is not pratibimba of redness-of-flower as pratibimba situates always as avyApya-vritti i.e. localized in a particular place within upAdhi.

And that is not how redness-of-crystal situates. It pervades entire crystal as vyApya-vritti. Thus, redness-of-crystal is not pratibimba, which is as satya as bimba. Redness-of-crystal is rather AbhAsa and is therefore mithyA. Now, this logic has no connection as to whether red-flower is in contact with eyes or not. The redness-of-crystal is pervaded and hence it is AbhAsa and is hence mithyA. It could have been averred as redness-of-flower if it were to be a pratibimba.

In another portion of advaita-siddhi, while positing the reflection in entities having different order of existence, reflection of redness-of-crystal in vyAvahArika-mirror is posited which implies acceptance of prAtibhAsika-tva of redness-of-crystal.

The relevant portion from Advaita-siddhi is reproduced as under: -

न च लौहित्यं स्फटिके न मिथ्या, किंतु धर्ममात्रप्रतिबिम्ब इति न पृथगुदाहरणमिति वाच्यम् । धर्मिभूतमुखादिनैरेपेक्ष्येण तद्धर्मभूतरूपादिप्रतिबिम्बादर्शनात् , प्रतिबिम्बस्याव्याप्यवृत्तित्वनियमेन लौहित्यस्य स्फटिके व्याप्यवृत्तिप्रतीत्ययोगाच्च । लौहित्ये स्फटिकस्य त्वारोपे तस्य प्रतिबिम्बत्वम् , स्फटिके लौहित्यारोपे तु तस्य मिथ्यात्वमिति विवेकः ।

यत्तुक्तं मरीचिकाजले सूर्यप्रतिबिम्बादर्शनात् बिम्बसमानसत्ताकत्वं प्रतिबिम्बोद्ग्राहित्वे प्रयोजकमिति । तन्; अध्यस्तस्य स्फटिकलौहित्यस्य दर्पणे प्रतिबिम्बदर्शनात् ।

Having said this, there is a dedicated chapter in advaita-siddhi named “Avidyaka-rajata-utpatti-vichAra” which deals with objection 1 of VedAnta-ParibhAshA. Here, three alternatives are discussed.

Scenario	Pratiyogi	PratiyogitA delimited by
Alternative 1	prAtibhAsika-rajata (by swarUpa)	Rajata-tva
Alternative 2	prAtibhAsika-rajata (by vyAvahArika-AkAreNa)	vyAvahArika-tva
Alternative 3	vyAvahArika-rajata (by swarUpa)	vyAvahArika-rajata-tva

While discussing the favoured alternative 1, AchArya says the one should follow one’s perception. Rajata felt as having appeared in shell and in the very same shell, there arose a perception that there is no silver here in three periods of time. On account of these perceptions alone, one is forced to accept creation of

prAtibhAsika-rajata as well as its atyanta-abhAva in three periods of time. Creation of prAtibhAsika-rajata is accepted on account of arthApatti “had there been no creation of rajata, the direct perception of rajata would not have been possible”.

However, in alternative 2, AchArya discusses another option. यद्वा – न स्वरूपेण त्रैकालिकनिषेधप्रतियोगित्वम्, किन्तु पारमार्थिकत्वाकारेण. Here, the creation is of prAtibhAsika-rajata but the negation is through vyAdhikaraNa-dharma i.e. vyAvahArika-tva. This is the same view as taken in VedAnta-ParibhAshA. It is interesting to see as to how does AchArya tackle the questions raised against this view.

Objection 1 against alternative 2: During the appearance of prAtibhAsika-rajata, there is perception of vyAvahArika-tva also in rajata. How then can it be negated in all three periods of time because just as prAtibhAsika-rajata was created, vyAvahArika-tva would also be created?

Answer: The perceived vyAvahArika-tva of prAtibhAsika-rajata is prAtibhAsika only. Hence, that is not negated. What is negated is the vyAvahArika-tva which inheres in other places such as shell.

Objection 2 against alternative 2: Only that can be negated which has been perceived earlier. The prAtibhAsika-rajata seen earlier was not perceived as qualified by the vyAvahArika-tva of shell. But you are negating that. Thus, you are negating that which was not perceived.

Answer: In case of vyAdhikaraNa-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitA-nirUpita-abhAva, this rule itself is not valid.

In alternative 3, the pratiyogI of negation is held to be vyAvahArika-rajata itself यद्वा – लौकिकपरमार्थरजतस्यैव तत्र त्रैकालिकनिषेधः.

Objection against alternative 3: Here there is certainly violation of the rule of non-negation of something which was not perceived. Since you do not accept anyathA-khyAti, vyAvahArika-rajata was never perceived and yet you are negating that.

Answer: No. Though there was no perception by pratyaksha of vyAvahArika-rajata, still there was perception through memory. And hence, the rule is not violated.

With this background, it is clear that the preference of advaita is swarUpa-nishedha of prAtibhAsika-rajata and it is only by way of concession the other alternatives are used.